

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 98-2016**

---

GEORGE ELWOOD ODUM,

versus

Plaintiff - Appellant,

INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN'S ASSOCIATION,  
Local 1751 of Georgetown, South Carolina,

and

Defendant - Appellee,

INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN'S ASSOCIATION,

Defendant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
South Carolina, at Charleston. Patrick Michael Duffy, District  
Judge. (CA-96-3798-2-23)

---

Submitted: January 21, 1999

Decided: February 3, 1999

---

Before LUTTIG, MOTZ, and KING, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

George Elwood Odum, Appellant Pro Se. Grover Cleveland Seaton,  
III, Moncks Corner, South Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.  
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

George Elwood Odum appeals the district court's orders dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2 (1994) complaint and denying his motion for reconsideration. Odum's case was referred to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) (1994). The magistrate judge recommended that the union's summary judgment motion be granted. The district court adopted the magistrate's report and recommendation. See Odum v. International Longshoremen's Ass'n, No. CA-96-3798-2-23 (D.S.C. May 19, 1998).\*

The timely filing of objections to a magistrate judge's recommendation is necessary to preserve appellate review of the substance of that recommendation. See Wells v. Shriners Hosp., 109 F.3d 198, 201 (4th Cir. 1997); see generally Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985). Odum has waived appellate review by failing to timely file objections. Further, the district court did not abuse its discretion in denying Odum's motion for reconsideration, because Odum's objections were not timely filed. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); Orpiano v. Johnson, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982). Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process. DISMISSED

---

\* The district court's order was filed on May 14, 1998; the judgment and the order were both entered on the docket on May 19, 1998. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 58, 79(a).